



# PUBLIC NOTICE

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
1919 M STREET N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20554

1704

---

News media information 202/632-5050. Recorded listing of releases and texts 202/632-0002.

February 21, 1989

**PROCESSING OF FM APPLICATIONS PURSUANT TO MM DOCKET 87-121  
NEW TENDERABILITY REQUIREMENT**

In the Report and Order in MM Docket 87-121, adopted December 12, 1988 (Amendment of Part 73 of the Commission's Rules to Permit short-spaced FM Station Assignments by Using Directional Antennas), the Commission adopted new rules by which FM broadcast station applicants are afforded additional flexibility in site selection. These rules allow FM broadcast station transmitters to be located at sites that do not meet one or more of the minimum distance separation requirements set forth in 47 C.F.R. § 73.207, provided that contour protection is demonstrated with the pertinent short-spaced assignments, applications and/or allotments.

Applications for stations that request authorization pursuant to the new rule (47 C.F.R. § 73.215) adopted in MM Docket No. 87-121 are entitled only to protection of the facilities proposed. Therefore, applicants for such stations must expressly request processing pursuant to the new rule and must include an appropriate exhibit demonstrating compliance. This will allow immediate identification of the appropriate protection to be afforded proposed facilities. Failure to provide this information would afford an application that is to be processed under the new rule more protection than it is entitled to and thus unnecessarily restrict other applicants. Therefore, omission of the appropriate exhibit will result in return of the application as not substantially complete at tender. This requirement for an exhibit has been added to the list of tender criteria established in MM Docket 84-750, 50 Fed. Reg. 19936, 19945 (1985)(Appendix D) and utilized in evaluating the substantial completeness of applications under the FM "hard look" processing procedures. A list of those tender criteria adopted in MM Docket 84-750 and reproduced in Public Notice, Mimeo No. 4580, May 16, 1985, is attached hereto as Attachment A.

In order to integrate this new tender criteria into the tender review process, the Commission has authorized the addition of a question to Section V-B of FCC Forms 301 (Application for Authority to Construct or Make Changes in a Commercial Broadcast Station) and 340 (Application for Authority to Construct or Make Changes in a Noncommercial Educational Broadcast Station). This question will require an engineering study to establish the lack of prohibited overlap of the protected and interfering contours of facilities separated by less than the minimum distance separation requirements set forth in 47 C.F.R. § 73.207. However, the revised Forms 301 and 340 will not be available immediately. Therefore, upon the effective date of the new rules

(over)

and until the revised forms are available, applicants requesting authorization pursuant to the new rules adopted in MM Docket 87-121 must include, as a supplement to the old Form 301 or 340, a copy of Attachment B hereto and the exhibit(s) required therein. (Attachment B also appears as Appendix C to the Report and Order in MM Docket 87-121). Failure of any applicant requesting authorization pursuant to the new rules adopted in MM Docket 87-121 to submit Attachment B and the exhibit(s) required therein with their application form will result in return of the application as not substantially complete at tender.

For further information, please contact Lilo Cunningham at 632-6485.

- FCC -



# PUBLIC NOTICE

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
1919 M STREET N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20554

4580

News media information 202/254-7874.

Recorded listing of releases and texts 202/632-0002.  
May 16, 1985

## STATEMENT OF NEW POLICY REGARDING COMMERCIAL FM APPLICATIONS THAT ARE NOT SUBSTANTIALLY COMPLETE OR ARE OTHERWISE DEFECTIVE

As part of our effort to expedite applications in conjunction with the implementation of the new "window" and "first come, first serve" processing procedures (Report and Order in MM Docket 84-750, Adopted March 14, 1985), we are adopting a new policy with respect to the definition and treatment of applications that are defective or not substantially complete when filed. 1/

Expedition of processing in the face of the possibility of a large increase in commercial FM applications compels us to shift to the beginning of the process some of the application checks previously made later in the process. This shift may well result in a loss of filing status for a returned application that it otherwise would have retained under the previous processing procedures. Such an outcome cannot be avoided if we are to achieve the benefits of the new window and first come, first serve processing procedures.

At the time an application for a commercial FM station or for a modification to an existing commercial FM station is tendered and before an application reference number is assigned, the application will be given a thorough initial review to determine if it is substantially complete. Although all applicable elements of Form 301 are examined by the Commission staff in the course of processing a construction-permit application, certain items are much more critical than others. Without them, processing simply cannot commence. A substantially complete application, one that the Commission deems in condition or sufficient for tender, must meet all of the following requirements.

1. The applicant's name and address must be provided. Failure of an applicant to do so renders it impossible for the processing staff:
  - a. to communicate with the applicant concerning the contents of the application; and
  - b. to discern and resolve issues relating to the applicant's identity, e.g., multiple-ownership and alien-interest questions.

1/ This policy applies only to commercial FM applicants. AM applicants and non-commercial FM applicants are still subject to the policy set out in our Public Notice of August 2, 1984. TV applicants remain subject to applicable case law.

2. In recent years, the Commission has reduced the amount of information required to be provided in applying for a construction permit and has accordingly simplified Form 301. Applicants are now permitted to make certifications of various types instead of having to provide evidentiary showings. Having relieved applicants of the need to make such showings, the Commission attaches considerable importance to the certifications that take their place. Accordingly, certifications in the following areas are crucial in the absence of full showings.
  - a. Compliance with 47 U.S.C. §310(b). An application which violates the alien-interest provisions of the Communications Act is statutorily ungrantable. Failure to respond to the question by which certification of compliance is invited renders the application so fundamentally defective that further processing is unwarranted.
  - b. Financial ability to construct. The Commission authorizes new or changed facilities with the expectation that such will be built quickly and that service will be expeditiously provided via those facilities to the public. It is pointless to grant an authorization of facilities that cannot be built. It is likewise pointless to process an application where a response to certification of financial ability to construct is not provided.
  - c. Compliance with the local public notice provisions of 47 C.F.R. §73.3580. It is important that local public notice occur. An informed local populace can bring to the Commission's attention information about the applicant or the facility proposal that might otherwise remain undetected. Thus, where local public notice is required, an applicant who fails to respond to the appropriate item of Form 301 will have its application returned as not sufficient for tender.
  - d. Site availability. The Commission does not require of applicants absolute certainty of site availability, but rather reasonable assurance. An application specifying an unavailable site per se frustrates the Commission's stated goal of expeditious introduction of service. Such a filing requires an amendment specifying a site change before grant or a further application for construction-permit modification after grant. To avoid vacuous and sequential filings, the Commission has imposed a requirement of site-availability certification which includes the name and address of the site

owner or his agent. Failure of an applicant to provide the requisite certification in the form set forth in Appendix B of the Report and Order in Docket 84-750, supra, will result in the application being deemed not substantially complete.

3. Questions 6 and 8 of Section II, Form 301 deal with matters crucial to multiple-ownership determinations. In response to these questions, applicants are to indicate whether or not they or their relatives (immediate family) have any other pending applications or broadcast interests. If the answer to either question is positive, explanatory exhibits must be provided. Leaving these questions unanswered, as a practical matter, makes it impossible for the processing staff to begin a multiple-ownership analysis. In light of our expressed policy dealing with the filing of multiple applications (see Second Report and Order in Docket 84-231, FCC 85-124, Adopted March 14, 1985 and Released April 12, 1985), failure to respond prevents the staff from beginning its ownership analysis and thus renders the applicant's filing not substantially complete.
4. Compliance with the Commission's technical rules is evaluated in the course of an acceptability study. Certain engineering data must be present for such a technical acceptability study to be made. The absence of one or more elements of those data, listed below, prevents a determination of acceptability and thus renders the application not substantially complete.
  - a. The geographic coordinates, to the nearest second, of the proposed transmitter site must be provided. Absence of these data makes it impossible to determine the distances from the proposed site to other proposed or existing broadcast facilities and to the community of license. In the commercial FM service, spacing determines acceptability of an application where mutual exclusivity exists with respect to a given allocation, see Trend Broadcasting, Inc., 18 FCC 2d 749 (1969), and determines when mutual exclusivity exists between applicants for or permittees of different allocations. The geographic location also determines whether protection must be afforded to Commission monitoring facilities and to radio quiet zones (see 47 C.F.R. §73.1030), marks the center of the "blanketing" area (see 47 C.F.R. §73.315), and is fundamental to analysis of a proposal's environmental effects and electromagnetic effects on other, nearby communications facilities.
  - b. A transmitter site map as described in Form 301, Section V-B, Item 13, and in our Public Notice, Mimeo 3693, released April 5, 1985. Such a map allows the staff to verify the

coordinates of the proposed site, the presence of other, nearby communications facilities and of obstructing terrain features (see 47 C.F.R. §73.315), and the ground elevation of the transmitter site. The last parameter has a key influence on important features of the antenna installation--radiation-center heights above ground and mean sea level, from which, with other data, antenna height above average terrain (HAAT) is derived.

- c. The channel number and community of the allocation must be supplied. Since the commercial FM allocation system is organized on the basis of a Table comprising numbered channels and targeted communities, any evaluation of an application must consider these fundamental items.
- d. Effective Radiated Power must be specified. Our technical rules prescribe minimum and maximum permissible power levels. Application processing includes a determination that proposed operating power falls within the range defined for the particular class of station occupying or intended to occupy the allocation. Certain allocations have limitations imposed on ERP, as do some stations authorized prior to implementation of the Table Method of Allocations. International agreements also influence permissible ERP levels in border areas. The operating power is so basic a parameter of a broadcast facility that it simply must be specified. Accordingly, its absence will render an application not substantially complete.
- e. Also necessary are the antenna heights above average terrain, above ground level, and above mean sea level. These three are interrelated and must be specified consistently, as is the case with all other crucial engineering parameters. Antenna height is as elemental a facility parameter as is ERP. It also is subject to permissible-range values as a function of station class and, with ERP, determines the coverage area of a facility for a given signal strength. Antenna height is also limited in certain cases by international treaty or by allocation constraints. Antenna height and ERP are also used to determine adverse potential to radio quiet zones, adjacent and co-channel "grandfathered" stations, and to FCC monitoring facilities. Antenna height above ground affects the environmental and aerial-navigation aspects of a facility proposal. Clearly, the various antenna heights are employed in a number of processing evaluations by the staff. Their absence, or the absence of any one of them, renders the application not substantially complete.

- f. An answer to Item 7, Section V-B must be provided, as whether or not a directional antenna is proposed is a fundamental issue. If a positive response is given, all data specified in 47 C.F.R. §73.316(d) must be included in an accompanying engineering exhibit. Without this information, the processing staff cannot determine the proper location of signal-strength contours, whether city-grade coverage is provided as required, whether adequate protection to short-spaced stations is to be given, and whether or not the proposed directional response complies with our technical rules and appears to be stable.
- g. A map or maps satisfying the requirements of Item 10, Section V-B and clearly and legibly showing the proposed 60 and 70 dBu contours and the legal boundaries of the community of license must be provided. Such maps permit ascertainment of compliance with city-grade requirements and permit verification of signal-strength contour predictions. They are also employed in determining comparative levels of proposed service.
- h. Section V-G must be provided as part of any Form 301 application proposing construction of a new facility or any change in transmitter site or antenna-structure height to existing facilities. In accord with our existing procedure, for side-mounting proposals involving an existing support structure, Section V-G shall show the application's purpose as, "Alteration of existing antenna structure." The "Facilities Requested" portion shall contain a description of the side-mounting proposal. Section V-G will be accompanied by a tower-sketch exhibit as required by Item 6.

Further, because of the critical importance of the applicant's certification of the correctness of the data contained in the application as of the date of filing, unsigned applications will not be accepted for tender.

If any of the above information is missing, the application will be returned as not sufficient for tender. If any of the above information is present but, on the face of the application, visibly incorrect or inconsistent, the application will be treated in accordance with the following guidelines. If the needed information can be derived or the discrepancy resolved, confidently and reliably, drawing on the application as a whole, such defect will not render the application not sufficient for tender. However, if the critical data cannot be derived or the inconsistency resolved within the confines of the application and with a high degree of confidence, the presence of the clearly void data will be treated as functionally equivalent to the absence of such data. In such instances, the defective application will be deemed not sufficient for tender. If the application is returned

(over)

during the initial check as not sufficient for tender, we will not permit the applicant to remedy the defect and have its resubmitted application accepted nunc pro tunc in order to be grouped with other applications filed by a window closing date or in order to be considered first filed when a window does not apply.

Where an application is timely filed within and in response to a filing window, at the initial screening we will consider the application as originally filed, together with any amendments filed within the window period. Where "first come, first serve" processing rules apply, the application only as originally filed will be considered. If an applicant discovers that its "first come" application is not sufficient for tender, it must file a new, corrected application (and request return of its earlier application) to cure the tenderability defect. Nunc pro tunc treatment will not be afforded in such cases.

If any of the defects listed above are overlooked during the initial review and are found later in the process, the application will be returned as inadvertently accepted for tender and, if resubmitted, will not be accepted nunc pro tunc. Return of the application will void the application reference number inadvertently assigned and whatever rights of tender might have been associated with it.

An application found to be sufficient for tender will be studied to determine its acceptability for filing, that is, to determine whether it is in compliance with applicable Commission rules. If it is found acceptable for filing, it will be included in a Public Notice of Acceptance. If found to be unacceptable for filing, it will be returned and will not be accepted later on a nunc pro tunc basis.

If an application is accepted for filing but is subsequently found not to be grantable, the applicant, if not mutually exclusive with other applicants, will be given one opportunity to correct the application. If the acceptable but not grantable application is mutually exclusive, an appropriate issue will be specified in the Hearing Designation Order, or a post-designation amendment, if appropriate, will be required.



Applicants requesting processing pursuant to 47 C.F.R. §73.215 must submit this page and the required exhibits with FCC Form 301 ("Application for Authority to Construct or Make Changes in a Commercial Broadcast Station"), or FCC Form 340 ("Application for Authority to Construct or Make Changes in a Noncommercial Educational Broadcast Station"), as appropriate.

Authorization Pursuant  
to 47 C.F.R. §73.215

If authorization pursuant to 47 C.F.R. §73.215 is requested, attach as an Exhibit a complete engineering study to establish the lack of prohibited overlap of contours involving affected stations. The engineering study must include the following:

Exhibit No.



- (a) Protected and interfering contours, in all directions (360°), for the proposed operation.
- (b) Protected and interfering contours, over pertinent arcs, of all short-spaced assignments, applications and allotments, including a plot showing each transmitter location, with identifying call letters or file numbers, and indication of whether facility is operating or proposed. For vacant allotments, use the reference coordinates as transmitter location.
- (c) When necessary to show more detail, an additional allocation study utilizing a map with a larger scale to clearly show prohibited overlap will not occur.
- (d) A scale of kilometers and properly labeled longitude and latitude lines, shown across the entire exhibit(s). Sufficient lines should be shown so that the location of the sites may be verified.
- (e) The official title(s) of the map(s) used in the exhibit(s).

NOTE: Applicants not requesting processing pursuant to 47 C.F.R. §73.215 do not need to submit this page with their application.